

**REMARKS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application. Claims 1-9 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 have been amended. Claim 3 has been cancelled, without prejudice. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicant appreciates the Office Action's indication that claims 3 and 5 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include the allowable feature of claim 3, now cancelled.

**Claim Objections**

(1) The Office Action objected to claims 1-4 and 8 for use of the phrase "sprocket." Claims 1-4 and 8 have been amended to recite "core" instead of "sprocket," as recommended by the Office Action.

(2) The Office Action objected to claim 3 for use of the phrase "is linearly sliding." Claim 3 has been cancelled, and the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into claim 1. In claim 1, the language "is linearly sliding" has been recast as "mounted to linearly slide," as recommended by the Office Action.

(3) The Office Action objected to claim 2 for containing a reference character not

enclosed in parentheses. Claim 2 has been amended to delete all reference characters.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Document 2001-206602 to Tozaki (“Tozaki”). Claims 1 and 8 are the independent claims. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite “a support mounted to linearly slide on a lateral wall of the housing, and moved by a cam-type regulating member, rotating on said wall, to adapt the position of each of said projecting elements to different dimensions of said core,” which was previously recited by allowable claim 3. The Office Action indicated that the “support mounted to linearly slide on a lateral wall of the housing” was the primary reason for the indication of allowability of claim 3. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Tozaki. Claims 2, 4, and 6 depend from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Tozaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,820,068 to Hosomi et al. (“Hosomi”). Claim 7 depends from claim 1, which, as explained above, has been amended to include the allowable feature of claim 3, now cancelled. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 7 based on Tozaki in view of Hosomi is now moot.

New Claim

New claim 9 has been added. Claim 9 is similar to claim 1, and recites the allowable feature of claim 3, now cancelled. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that new claim 9 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Applicant: Piero Salussolia  
Appl. No.: 10/561,797

Date: November 26, 2008

/Steven J. Schwarz/  
Steven J. Schwarz  
Registration No. 47,070  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Direct Dial: (202) 344-4295  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

#999992